

IFW 2871



PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<h1 style="text-align: center;">TRANSMITTAL FORM</h1> <p style="text-align: center;">(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)</p>		Application Number	09/589,881 – Conf. #1734
		Filing Date	June 9, 2000
		First Named Inventor	Jeongmin MOON
		Art Unit	2871
		Examiner Name	H. C. Nguyen
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	5	Attorney Docket Number	3430-0105P

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Reply Brief to Examiner's Supplemental Answer
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content;">Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm Name	BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP		
Signature			
Printed name	Esther H. Chong		
Date	August 14, 2006	Reg. No.	40,953



REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER - PATENTS

PATENT
3430-0105P

IN THE U. S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Appellant: Jeongmin MOON	Conf. No.: 1734
Serial No.: 09/589,881	Group: 2871
Filed: June 9, 2000	Examiner: H. NGUYEN
For: REFLECTIVE LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE HAVING AN AUXILIARY LIGHT SOURCE DEVICE	

REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER

MS REPLY BRIEF - PATENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DATE: August 14, 2006

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §41.41, this is a Reply to the Examiner's Supplemental Answer dated June 14, 2006. Applicant filed an Appeal Brief on June 1, 2005 to appeal the action of the Examiner dated September 23, 2004, finally rejecting claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-21, 23 and 24. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 21 are independent. The Examiner provided an Examiner's Answer dated August 9, 2005 and Applicant submitted a Reply Brief on October 11, 2005. Subsequently, the Examiner provided a Supplemental Examiner's Answer on June 14, 2006.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shinji et al. (U.S. Patent 6,259,854). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Funamoto et al. (EP 08 878 720). Applicant maintains all arguments previously made.

In addition Applicant emphasizes the following. Independent claim 1 is directed toward a light source device for a reflective LCD device. The light source device includes a light directing member whose lower surface includes a plurality of convex portions. Claim 1 recites a feature that when an angle between the lower surface and a surface connecting the planar surface of the convex portion is about 90°, the light reflected along an orthogonal direction to the liquid crystal display device is uniform.

The Examiner alleges that the above-recited feature is disclosed or inherent in Shinji. Figure 5 of Shinji illustrates a light guide with a trapezoid shaped protrusion ABCD, which the Examiner interprets to be equivalent to the convex portion as recited. Shinji discusses the characteristics of the luminance distribution and the angles of the trapezoidal surfaces of the protrusions. Angle δ in Figure 5 of Shinji is the complement of the angle described in claim 1. Thus, the angle δ should be near 0° when the claimed angle is about 90°. As noted in the Appeal Brief, Applicants agree that having

the angle δ between 0 and 2° is within the scope of the claimed angle being about 90°.

The Examiner acknowledges that Shinji is silent regarding whether any light from the light source 1 directed toward the reflecting plate 4 (see Figure 3) is orthogonal to the liquid crystal display when the angle δ is between 0 and 2°, but alleges this feature is inherent. However, even if the inherency is assumed, Shinji still fails to anticipate claim 1.

More specifically, the claim requires the light reflected along the orthogonal direction to be uniform when the angle between the lower surface and the surface connecting the planar surface is about 90°. For Shinji to anticipate this feature, the Examiner must demonstrate that when the angle δ is between 0° and 2°, the light is uniform.

However, Shinji specifically discloses that luminance is **not** uniform when the angle δ is near 0°. Shinji states, “A protruding resist pattern which has a **slope angle $\delta < 3^\circ$** ... was obtained ... When the distribution of luminance was measured, **its uniformity ratio of illuminance was bad** ...” See *Shinji*, column 11, lines 54-67. This is completely contrary to the feature as recited in claim 1.

Appl. No. 09/589,881
Reply Brief to Examiner's Supplemental Answer


Independent claims 11 and 21 recite similar features as claim 1. It is clear that Shinji cannot anticipate claims 1, 11 and 21 and the claims dependent thereon.


In view of the above, Applicants submit that the final rejection by the Examiner is incorrect. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner be reversed and that the application be allowed.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge any payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. This authorization applies to any additional fees required under 37 CFR §1.16 and 37 CFR §1.17 and in particular to fees for an extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000


EHC/HNS
3430-0105P